DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 480 SP 002 069

By- Crispin, David B.; Peterson, R. Duane

School Faculty Meetings--An Interaction Analysis.

Pub Date 69

Note- 6p.; Reported at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Convention, Los Angeles, California 1969

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.40

Descriptors- *Educational Research, Elementary School Teachers, Group Behavior, *Interaction Process Analysis, Participant Involvement, *Principals, Spontaneous Behavior, *Staff Meetings, *Teacher Behavior

Identifiers- Detroit, Indiana, Michigan, Wabash Valley

Two studies were conducted to determine the relationship between the principal's behavior and the teachers' behaviors during faculty meetings. The pilot study (conducted in the Wabash Valley) tested the hypothesis that the more indirect (willingly sharing authority with the teachers, incorporating their ideas) the principal's behavior is, the more supportive (willingly cooperative, participating) teachers' behaviors (behaviors of the individuals) will be. Graduate students trained in interaction analysis to .90 reliability observed and recorded data for 30 elementary school faculty meetings, 40 to 50 minutes long, held after school to discuss "Utilization of TeacherTime." No correlation was found between principals' and teachers' behaviors; teachers were supportive most of the time, regardless of principals' behaviors. The second study (conducted in metropolitan Detroit) was designed like the first except for the addition of two hypotheses: (1) The more indirect the principal's behavior the more supportive will be the group behavior. (2) The more indirect the principal's behavior the greater will be the amount of participation on the part of teachers. Statistical analysis of the data rejected all three hypotheses. It was concluded that although other research evidence reveals that teachers have some strong, negative attitudes regarding faculty meetings, such attitudes are not apparent from teachers' behaviors during faculty meetings. (SG)

ED025480
SP002067

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCHOOL FACULTY MEETINGS - AN INTERACTION ANALYSIS*

David B. Crispin
Associate Professor of Education
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana

and

R. Duane Peterson
Associate Professor of Education
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

In our previous study, reported at the A.E.R.A. Convention in New York in 1967 and in the May, 1968 issue of Contemporary Education, we found data that rejected our hypotheses regarding the effect of the principal's behavior upon the behaviors of teachers during school faculty meetings. The following is the design of that pilot study:

Hypothesis: The more indirect the principal's behavior, the more supportive will be the teachers' behaviors.

Operational Definitions:

Behavior - oral statements, and the manner in which statements are made including tone of voice and facial expression.

Direct Behavior (Principal) - the principal uses his authority, states his or the administration's position, ideas, or requirements - gives orders, directions-lectures, reads prepared directives or statements of policy - justifies his position or authority.

Indirect Behavior (Principal) - the principal willingly shares his authority with the teachers - shares and accepts both feelings and ideas - seems genuinely willing to be influenced by the teachers - encourages them to express themselves, aims for consensus.

Non-Supportive Behavior (teachers) - the teacher seems to be participating only because he has to - he is defensive, uncooperative - he seems bored, unattentive, uninterested - he is perfunctory, seems to be behaving simply to get rid of the task.

Supportive Behavior (teacher) - the teacher seems willingly cooperative - spontaneously, enthusiastically contributes feelings and ideas - he is attentively, seriously involved.

Independent Variable - the behaviors of the principals.

Dependent Variable - the behaviors of the teachers.

*Prepared for Presentation at A.E.R.A., Los Angeles, February 1969.

Controls - all faculty meetings were held after school and lasted 40-50 minutes. All principals and teachers discussed the topic, "Utilization of Teacher Time." All the schools are elementary and are located in the Wabash Valley, Indiana. Faculty size ranged from five to twenty-three and averaged eleven (our data revealed no correlation between group size and either of the variables).

Procedures: Graduate students selected from a graduate course in interaction analysis at Indiana State University were trained intensively by the use of films and TV tapes and live observing experiences until they achieved the level of .90 reliability in recording the categories. Behaviors were recorded sequentially as they occurred every three seconds or faster in case of change of speaker or behavior. Principals' behaviors were recorded with 1's; teachers', with o's. Direct (Principal) behaviors and Non-Supportive (teacher) behaviors were placed at the right of the column; Indirect (Principal) and Supportive (teacher behaviors, at the left. So that the record would not be distorted by a situation wherein one or two "supportive" teachers did most of the talking while the rest of the group was non-supportive, etc., a "G-factor" was recorded. "G" refers to group and is recorded as the observer's estimate of the supportiveness or non-supportiveness of the total group. When the G appears on the right of the column the observer found the group to be non-supportive; on the left, supportive. The days for the faculty meetings were randomly selected. When possible the observers were randomly assigned; however, the observers' work schedules determined their availability. When observers returned from a faculty meeting and presented their raw data, the meeting was discussed. For example, although all the principals did use the topic "Utilization of Teacher Time," at some faculty meetings things occurred such as committee reports, and readings of minutes, etc., and in one case even a brief birthday party; and such events were not included in the data for analysis. The raw data was then resolved into I/D's and S/N's:

$I/D = \frac{\text{Indirect}}{\text{Direct}}$ (Principal behavior) so that the more indirect the principal's behavior the higher the I/D ratio.

$S/N = \frac{\text{Supportive}}{\text{Non-Supportive}}$ (teacher behaviors) so that the more supportive the teachers' behaviors the higher the S/N ratio.

G factors were also totaled and are reported as G-S when the group was supportive during half or more than half of the total interactions; and, as G-N where the group was non-supportive half or more than half of the time. Therefore, the interaction can be analyzed in terms of our hypothesis, and if our hypothesis is supported by the data we should find a high I/D accompanied by a high S/N and a Supportive G.

The above research produced data representing some 20,000 interactions among principals and teachers during thirty faculty meetings in elementary schools in the Wabash Valley, Indiana -- Terre Haute, and small towns nearby. And our findings indicated no correlation ($r = .229$) between the principals' behaviors and the behaviors of the teachers; according to our definition of supportiveness the teachers were supportive nearly all the time regardless of the

directness or indirectness of the principals. Puzzeled by our findings we set out to conduct another field experiment which is the subject of this paper.

The present study follows the design of the pilot study except for two additional hypotheses.

Hypothesis I (same as pilot study):

the more indirect the principal's behavior, the more supportive will be the teachers' behaviors (behaviors of individuals).

Hypothesis II:

the more indirect the principal's behavior the more supportive will be the group behavior (G factor).

Hypothesis III:

the more indirect the principal's behavior the greater will be the amount of participation on the part of the teachers (the higher will be the teacher/principal ratio).

And our procedures and controls were the same as in the above study except that our trained observers were teachers and administrators (graduate students at Wayne State University) and our data are derived from faculty meetings in schools of Metropolitan Detroit, Michigan.

Table I sets forth the data derived from some 30,000 principal-teacher interactions during thirty six school faculty meetings.

TABLE I

Faculty Meeting	Principal's I/D (ranked)	Teachers' S/N (individuals)	Group S/N	Teacher / Principal ratio
1	*67.30	1379**	1379**	1.8
2	35.75	8.03	11.11	.9
3	*23.78	1528**	1528**	1.66
4	* 8.47	1936**	1936**	1.50
5	* 8.16	1469**	1469**	3.20
6	* 8.11	499**	499**	1.20
7	* 3.70	887**	887**	3.44
8	3.17	483**	483**	.41
9	1.84	334**	334**	.69
10	1.32	317**	317**	.41
11	1.08	397**	397**	1.00
12	.80	14.70	42	1.03
13	.79	90.70	734**	.67
14	.76	130**	130**	.25
15	.74	182**	182**	.57
16	.67	188	756	.77
17	* .52	658**	658**	3.44
18	.43	983**	983**	1.60
19	* .39	.58	1.9	2.20
20	.36	350**	350**	1.57
21	.36	28	12.20	1.50
22	.34	206**	206**	.36
23	.33	11.50	9.6	.69
24	.31	48	539**	.32
25	.29	1207**	1207**	1.40
26	.29	402**	402**	2.68
27	.22	145**	145**	1.00
28	.17	2.18	218**	.73
29	.17	325**	325**	.36
30	* .14	59	1626**	1.04
31	.13	319**	319**	.42
32	* .10	111.80	.60	1.1
33	.10	65	465**	1.2
34	* .09	16.10	309**	1.39
35	* .05	499**	499**	.10
36	.02	.14	257**	1.90

* = Female Principal
** = Total Behavior Was Supportive

Findings:

Analyzing our data by the IBM 1130 Statistical Package ($R_{ij} = \frac{C_{ij}}{S_i S_j}$), we find all three hypotheses rejected: I/D to S/N = .43; I/D to G-S/N = .34; and I/D to T/P = .14. And a cursory look at Table I also leads one to reject the three hypotheses. We find the four principals with the highest I/D's receiving a total of six instances of completely supportive teacher behaviors and the four principals with the lowest I/D's receiving five instances of completely supportive behavior. Also, the principal with the highest I/D effected a slightly lower T/P than the principal with the very lowest I/D.

The only statistically significant correlation occurred between the Group S/N and the S/N of individual teachers (R = .82), and this adds further weight to the evidence which suggests that,regardless of the behavior patterns of the principals, the teachers' behaviors were overwhelmingly supportive (as operationally defined in this research design).

Conclusions

The data collected by recording and analyzing some 50,000 interactions among principals and teachers during seventy six faculty meetings leads us to reject the hypothesis that the behavior of the principal significantly affects the behaviors of the teachers; all of these teachers whom we observed behaved pretty much the same while the principals' behaviors varied significantly. And this flies in the face of much that we have learned about leadership from psychology, social psychology, group dynamics and interaction analysis of teachers as classroom leaders (see especially the research of Amidon and his associates*). How explain our findings then?

A plausible explanation would seem to be this: that teachers, mature and professionally trained, behave "like teachers" during faculty meetings. They are generally polite, sincere, cooperative, and attentive, and they willingly participate. We found this to be so in small town Indiana where nearly all were (rather passive) NEA members as well as in Metropolitan Detroit where nearly all were members of very action-oriented (even militant) groups and where faculty meetings were "negotiated." Could it be that teachers have an image of themselves as teachers -- the ways in which teachers are supposed to behave during faculty meetings? And could it also be that teachers see themselves as leaders day after day in their classrooms and then empathize with the principal (the leader) during faculty meetings and therefore behave "appropriately."

In light of much of the research evidence which reveals some rather strong, negative attitudes teachers' hold regarding faculty meetings(see especially Blumberg and Amidon**), we conclude only that such attitudes are not evinced through the behaviors of teachers during faculty meetings.

*Amidon, Edmund and Hough, John, INTERACTION ANALYSIS: Theory, Research, and Application: Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1967.

**Blumberg,Arthur and Amidon, Edmund, A COMPARIONS OF TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL ATTITUDES TOWARD FACULTY MEETINGS: THE NASSP Bulletin, March, 1964.